



ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1. Name of Proponent:** Michael A. Vogt
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Chula Vista
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91911
- 3. Addresses and Phone Number of Proponent:** Eastlake Corporate Center LLC
821 Kuhn Drive, Suite 100
Chula Vista, CA 91914
(619) 591-2424
- 4. Name of Proposal:** Eastlake Business Center
- 5. Date of Checklist:** October 11, 2007
- 6. Case No.** IS-07-015

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS QUESTIONS:

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tress, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day/night views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------	---	---	---	------------------

Comments:

a) The project sites are located in a developed area containing a mix of commercial, residential and industrial uses. Immediately surrounding the project site are office buildings, industrial buildings, retail, residential, and roadways. The projects will alter existing views, however there are no designated scenic vistas on or near the project sites. Therefore, no impact to a scenic vista would occur as a result of this project.

b) The site was previously graded as part of a mass grading effort for the entire Business Center II. There are no scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or designated historic buildings on the project site or within the immediate project area. The Corporate Center (Area C) project is located along Otay Lakes Road, which is designated as a Scenic Roadway by the City of Chula Vista. Scenic Roadways in the City of Chula Vista have unique roadway characteristics, such as enhanced landscaping adjoining natural slopes and special design features that make traveling a pleasant visual experience. The proposed project will not impact the existing slope planting or improvements along Otay Lakes Road and therefore no impacts to the Scenic Roadway will occur. There are no State scenic highways in the project vicinity. Therefore, there are no impacts related to this issue, and no mitigation is required.

c) The proposed project would improve the existing visual character and quality of the sites, which are currently vacant. The Corporate Center (Area C) is envisioned as a well-designed and attractive urban development, consisting of a hotel and office building. The Design Center will be required to have further environmental review under CEQA when site-specific development is proposed.

The Design Center (Area B) project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Although the project will change the visual character of the site, it would not be considered degrading given the use of the existing site. Mitigation measures include the review of the projects by the City of Chula Vista's Design Review Board, observation of the special design objectives of the Design Guidelines for Eastlake Business Center II Supplemental SPA and the City of Chula Vista Design Manual. Less than significant impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings would result from the implementation of this project with the mitigation measures.

d.) Proper architectural design would ensure compliance with Section 19.66.100 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code. Exterior lighting would not be directed upward and would be designed and installed with appropriate shielding if necessary, to ensure that light does not spill horizontally beyond the limits of the development area onto adjacent roadways, and surrounding residential uses.

Mitigation: Mitigation Required. See Section F of the MND.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

a-c) The project site is presently located in a fully urban setting. The graded project site is neither in current agricultural production nor adjacent to property in agricultural production and contains no agricultural resources or designated farmland areas.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

a-e) See Mitigated Negative Declaration, Section E.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are required. See MND, Section F.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a) The project site is located in a fully urbanized developed area. Based upon a site visit conducted on July 20, 2007 by City staff no candidate, sensitive, or special status species are present within or immediately adjacent to the proposed development area A.
- b) Based upon the Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan, no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are present within or immediately adjacent to the proposed project site. Project sites B & C have been mass graded and site B is fully developed with wholesale/commercial businesses.
- c) No wetlands are present within or immediately adjacent to the proposed development area.
- d) Based upon the Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan no native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites exist within or immediately adjacent to the proposed development area.
- e) No impacts to any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance would result from the proposed project development.
- f) No impacts to local, regional or state habitat conservation plans would result since the project site is a designated development area pursuant to the adopted Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are not required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------	---	---	---	------------------

Guidelines § 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a) There are no buildings of historic value proposed for removal project sites B & C are presently vacant of all structures.
- b) Project site A is fully developed and project sites B & C have been mass graded. Based on this grading no cultural resources were identified within the project area, and no previously recorded sites are located within the project boundaries. Therefore, no cultural resources will be impacted by the proposed construction, and no further archaeological investigations are recommended for this project.
- c) The project area and surrounding area is considered to be paleontological sensitive pursuant to the San Diego Natural History Museum records.

Mitigation: Mitigation is required. See Section F of the MND.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv.	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

a-e) Project site "C", where development is proposed has been previously mass graded. There are no known or suspected seismic hazards associated with the project site. The project site lies about four miles west of the La Nacion Fault Zone (an inactive fault zone). The closest recently active fault is the Rose Canyon Fault, located about 14 miles west of the site. The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. Therefore, project compliance with applicable Uniform Building Code standards would adequately address any building safety/seismic concerns.

Geotechnics INC. prepared a Geotechnical/Soils report on August 2007. The report, approved by the City Engineering Department, states that no adverse geotechnical conditions were encountered which would prohibit the proposed development of project site C. The preparation and submittal of a final soils report will be required prior to the issuance of a grading permit as a standard engineering requirement.

In order to prevent silt discharge during construction, the developer will be required to comply with best management practices in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Permit. The appropriate standard erosion control measures would be identified in conjunction with preparation of final grading plans and would be monitored and implemented during construction by the Engineering Division. Therefore, the potential for the discharge of silt into city drainage systems would be less than significant.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are required. See Section F of the MND.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a-d) Project Site A is a fully developed wholesale business center. Project Site C has been mass graded and the project proposal does not involve the handling or emissions of hazardous materials.
- e-f) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport.
- g) The project as proposed and based on its location would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are noted.
- h) The project site is not adjacent to a wildlands area. No impacts related to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires are noted.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are not required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters (including impaired water bodies pursuant to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list), result in significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction, or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Result in a potentially significant adverse impact on groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, or place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a) The proposed grading and development of vacant site C would result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff. There is a potential for an increase in pollutant discharges. However, standard BMP requirements will reduce any potential impacts to water bodies to less than significant.
- b) The project would not result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- c) The proposed grading and development of vacant site C would result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff but would not result in adverse impacts to streams or rivers that would result in substantial erosion or siltation.
- d) The proposed grading and development of vacant site C would result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff but would not result in adverse impacts to streams or rivers that would result in substantial flooding or place structures in a flood zone.
- e) The proposal would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury or death involving flooding.
- f) The proposed grading and development of vacant site C would result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface runoff but would not exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage facilities.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are required. See Section F of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a. The project site is within an established industrial/residential community. The proposal would not result in a community being physically divided.
- b. The General Plan designates the project sites A, B & C as Business Center Manufacturing Park District. The project proposes a General Plan amendment from Limited Industrial to Commercial Retail for Area A only. Development on Area C will be subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and design review.
- c. The project would not conflict with the adopted City of Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

a-b) The proposal would not result in any loss of any known mineral on-site. Pursuant to the Environmental Impact Report for the City of Chula Vista General Plan, the State of California Department of Conservation has not designated the project site for mineral resource protection.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

a-d) See Mitigated Negative Declaration, Section E.

e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project development would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are required. See Mitigated Negative Declaration, Section F.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Comments:

a-c) The proposal would not induce population growth or displace housing stock or people.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

- a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Comments:

- a) According to the Fire Department, the proposal would not have a significant effect upon or result in a need for new or altered fire protection services. The CVFD currently meets the City’s threshold standard in the vicinity of the project. A fire station (#8) is located less than a mile from the project area. The payment or credit of fees will adequately mitigate potential cost impacts associated with the project.
- b) According to the Police Department, the proposal would not have a significant effect upon or result in a need for substantial new or altered police protection services. The CVPD currently meets the City’s threshold criteria for Priority I Calls for Service (CFS). The payment of fees will adequately mitigate potential cost impacts associated with the project.
- c) The proposed project is not residential in nature and as such would not induce population growth.
- d) Because the proposed project would not induce population growth, it would not create a demand for neighborhood or regional parks or facilities or impact existing park facilities.
- e) The proposed project would not have a significant effect upon or result in a need for new or expanded governmental services and could continue to be served by existing public infrastructure.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) | Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Comments:

- a) Because the proposed project would not induce population growth, it would not create a demand for neighborhood or regional parks or facilities nor impact existing neighborhood parks or recreational facilities.
- b) The project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments: See Mitigated Negative Declaration, Section E.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures are required. See Section F of the MND.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a) The project is located within an urban setting presently served by all utilities and service systems and would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB. Therefore, no adverse impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would occur as a result of the proposed project for Area C.
- b) The proposal would not require new construction nor expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities. Development of the project will not impact existing water or wastewater treatment facilities.
- c) No construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be necessary as a result of the proposed project. The project is required to implement Best Management Practices to prevent pollution of storm drainage systems and comply with the City Storm Water Management Requirements therefore; environmental impacts would be less than significant.
- d) The project site is within the Otay Water District service territory. The Water District has provided a letter stating that they have the capacity to serve the proposed project.
- e) The City of Chula Vista has sufficient wastewater capacity to serve this project. No impacts are noted.
- f) The project will be served by a local landfill that has adequate capacity.
- g) The proposed project will comply with all state and local solid waste requirements. No impacts are noted.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

XVII. THRESHOLDS

Will the proposal adversely impact the City's Threshold Standards?

A. <u>Library</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by buildout. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the city-wide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
B) <u>Police</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81 percent of "Priority One" emergency calls within seven (7) minutes and maintain an average response time to all "Priority One" emergency calls of 5.5 minutes or less.				
b) Respond to 57 percent of "Priority Two" urgent calls within seven (7) minutes and maintain an average response time to all "Priority Two" calls of 7.5 minutes or less.				
C) <u>Fire and Emergency Medical</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the City within 7 minutes in 80% of the cases (measured annually).				
D) <u>Traffic</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Threshold Standards require that all intersections must operate at a Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better, with the exception that Level of Service (LOS) "D" may occur during the peak two hours of the day at signalized intersections. Signalized intersections west of I-805 are not to operate at a LOS below their 1991 LOS. No intersection may reach LOS "E" or "F" during the average weekday peak hour. Intersections of arterials with freeway ramps are exempted from this Standard.				
E) <u>Parks and Recreation Areas</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The Threshold Standard for Parks and Recreation is 3 acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities/1,000 population east of I-805.				
F) <u>Drainage</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Threshold Standards require that storm water flows and volumes not exceed City Engineering Standards. Individual projects will provide necessary improvements consistent with the Drainage Master Plan(s) and City Engineering Standards.				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>G) <u>Sewer</u></p> <p>The Threshold Standards require that sewage flows and volumes not exceed City Engineering Standards. Individual projects will provide necessary improvements consistent with Sewer Master Plan(s) and City Engineering Standards.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>H) <u>Water</u></p> <p>The Threshold Standards require that adequate storage, treatment, and transmission facilities are constructed concurrently with planned growth and that water quality standards are not jeopardized during growth and construction.</p> <p>Applicants may also be required to participate in whatever water conservation or fee off-set program the City of Chula Vista has in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------	---	---	---	------------------

Comments:

- a) The project would not induce population growth; therefore, no impacts to library facilities would result. No adverse impact to the City's Library Threshold standards would occur as a result of the proposed project.
- b) No adverse impact to the City's Police threshold standards would occur as a result of the proposed project. Police Department states that they can continue to provide service at current levels
- c) According to the Fire Department, adequate fire protection and emergency medical services can continue to be provided to the site. Although the Fire Department has indicated they will provide service to the project, the project will contribute to the incremental increase in fire service demand throughout the City. This increased demand on fire services will not result in a significant cumulative impact. No adverse impact to the City's Fire threshold standards would occur as a result of the proposed project.
- d) The surrounding street segments and intersections continue to operate in compliance with the City's Traffic Threshold Standards at acceptable LOS levels with the exception of the intersections of Otay Lakes Road/Vons Driveway and Showroom Place/Fenton Street, which operate at an LOS "F" during PM peak hours with or without the project. The intersection impacts to Otay Lakes Road/Vons Driveway are considered to be cumulative. The traffic impacts to Showroom Place/Fention Street are considered to be direct. In order to reduce the cumulative and direct impacts, mitigation is required. See Mitigated Negative Declaration, Section F.
- e) The project does not propose residential development; therefore, this Threshold Standard is not applicable.
- f) The applicant proposes new drainage facilities on the project site in order to properly convey stormwater from the developed site to existing city drainage facilities. No adverse impacts to the City's storm drainage system or City's Drainage Threshold standards will occur as result of the proposed project.
- g) Based on the Sewer study prepared by K&S Engineering on August 2007, the Engineering Division has determined that the existing sewer facilities are adequate to serve proposed project development on Area C and existing and proposed development on Area A only. No new sewer facilities are anticipated to be required and no adverse impacts to the City's Sewer Threshold standards will occur as a result of the proposed project.
- h) Pursuant to correspondence received from the Otay Water District, the District has the terminal long-term water storage capacity to serve the proposed project. Otay Water District indicates that water service can be provided at the required pressures once the owner makes all necessary district deposits to cover engineering and inspection costs. The existing domestic water services and fire service that currently service the project site are adequate and will not need to be altered. Project impacts to the District's storage, treatment, and transmission facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation: Mitigation Required (Drainage) See Section E & F of the MND.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current project, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

- a) The project site presently consists principally of graded land and developed commercial land uses. The project site is located within an established urbanized community. The site lies within the designated development area of the adopted Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan. There are no sensitive plant or animal species or cultural resources on the site.
- b) As described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, significant direct and cumulative project impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance through the required mitigation measures
- c) The project does not propose or have environmental effects, which will foreseeably cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

XIX. PROJECT REVISIONS OR MITIGATION MEASURES:

Project mitigation measures are contained in Section F, Mitigation Necessary to Avoid Significant Impacts, and Table 1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, of Mitigated Negative Declaration IS-07-015.

XX. AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION MEASURES

By signing the line(s) provided below, the Applicant and Operator stipulate that they have each read, understood and have their respective company's authority to and do agree to the mitigation measures contained herein, and will implement same to the satisfaction of the Environmental Review Coordinator. Failure to sign the line(s) provided below prior to posting of this Mitigated Negative Declaration with the County Clerk shall indicate the Applicant's and Operator's desire that the Project be held in abeyance without approval and that the Applicant and Operator shall apply for an Environmental Impact Report.

Michael A. Vogt, President of IRE Development

Signature of Applicant

Date

XXI. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the previous pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geophysical | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

XXII. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. ☒

I find that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an Environmental Impact Report is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project may have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An Environmental Impact Report is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. ☐

Benjamin Guerrero
Senior Planner
City of Chula Vista

Date

J:\Planning\BenG\Initial Study\IS-07-015.doc